

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 3 and 9 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. and Teo. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “the video camera being mounted to the aircraft and having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft.” Claim 9 similarly has been amended to recite “a video camera mounted to the aircraft ... the video camera having a landscape camera lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft.” Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 5, lines 1-12, which describes the 140° horizontal by 128° vertical field of view lens that can be rotated 90° about the mounting axis JK, perpendicular to a tangent LM to the surface of the aircraft, providing a maximum angular size of the video frame that is approximately 140° vertically and 128° horizontally, which is 90° from the normal aspect ratio orientation of the lens.

The Examiner indicated that Henderson et al. discloses a multi-camera closed circuit television system, comprising substantially the same video camera mounted to the aircraft. Referring to Henderson et al. at column 5, line 59 to column 6, about line 14, Henderson et al. discloses a landscape camera system with a vertical viewing camera 22 providing a downward view, and a horizontally viewing camera 24 providing a forward looking view. As is illustrated in Figs. 3, 5 and 7 of Henderson et al., the vertical

viewing camera and the horizontally viewing camera have lenses that are not rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed. While the camera control module unit 32 of Henderson et al. may be considered to be mounted perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, the camera control module unit of Henderson et al. is not rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed.

Rotation of the wide angle lens of the video camera of the present invention about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft allows orientation of the field of view of the lens of the video camera independently of the axial orientation of the aircraft, about the mounting axis JK that is perpendicular to the tangent LM to the surface of the aircraft, which is not possible with the camera system of Henderson et al. As is discussed at column 7, lines 24-27, the camera system of Henderson et al. provides separate bracket assemblies for the two separate cameras for rotational and elevational adjustments of the individual camera heads fields of view, about two entirely different axes, and not about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Henderson et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a video camera mounted to an aircraft and having a wide angle or landscape camera lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed. Baker et al. discloses hemispheric imaging, and Teo discloses compositing images, but it is respectfully submitted that Baker et al. and Teo also do not teach, disclose or suggest a video camera mounted to an aircraft and having a

wide angle or landscape camera lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed. The Examiner indicated that one can not show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where rejections are based on combination of references, citing *In re Keller*. However, it is respectfully submitted that even when taken in combination, the combined teachings of Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo do not teach, disclose or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the combination of a closed circuit television mounted to an aircraft, comprising a video camera mounted to an aircraft and having a wide angle or landscape camera lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are novel and inventive over Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo, taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 9-11 should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw

Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
114700.1